

**Exhibit 300 (BY2009) - REDACTED**

PART ONE	
OVERVIEW	
1. Date of Submission:	2007-06-01
2. Agency:	015
3. Bureau:	10
4. Name of this Capital Asset:	Financial Information and Reporting Standardization (FIRST)
5. Unique Project Identifier:	015-10-01-14-01-1310-00
6. What kind of investment will this be in FY2009?	
Mixed Life Cycle	
7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB?	
FY2008	
8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap.	
<p>The Financial Management Service (FMS) serves as the federal government's central financial manager through the application of sound cash management practices and increased use of automated payments, collections, and accounting and reporting systems. FMS is comprised of four business lines, one of which is governmentwide accounting. FMS provides the central accounting for the Federal Government. The Financial Information and Reporting Standardization initiative (FIRST) will automate the maintenance and distribution of U.S. Standard General Ledger (USSGL) accounting rules and guidance. It will also integrate the USSGL guidance with the data collection of all accounting trial balance (ATB) data, thus providing a standardized method of collecting, storing, reporting, and analyzing the trial balance data. The single data collection application will replace four collection processes in applications that currently each rely on their own manual processes to maintain USSGL accounting standards, and will provide USSGL ATB information to a fifth application. The investment will result in three integrated applications - one for accounting standards and guidance (SID), one for data collection and storage (ATB), and one for compilation and consolidation of the Financial Report of the U.S. Government (GFRS) - that are compliant with FMS' to-be technical reference model. It will also facilitate more effective, efficient, and comprehensive accounting validations of the agency trial balance data to ensure accuracy and consistency with accounting standards, with the FMS central accounting system, and within the trial balance data itself. The increased number and comprehensiveness of the validations will allow FMS to provide better feedback to agencies concerning the accuracy and consistency of their trial balance accounting data. As a result of the feedback provided by FMS, agency data should improve, intragovernmental eliminations should become less of a problem, and the Financial Report should move closer to obtaining a clean audit opinion.</p>	
9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request?	
yes	
9.a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval?	
2007-08-16	
10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit?	
yes	
11. Project Manager Name:	
Project Manager Phone:	
11.a. What is the current FAC-P/PM certification level of the project/program manager?	
TBD	
12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project.	
yes	

12.a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)?	
yes	
12.b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)	
no	
13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?	
yes	
If yes, select the initiatives that apply:	
Expanded E-Government	
Financial Performance	
13.a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)	
Support of Financial Performance PMA: 1) Improved timeliness of accounting trial balance (ATB) data collection process; 2) Improved access to USSGL information; 3) Improved accounting consistency between proprietary and budgetary ATB data. Support of Expanded E-Government by: 1) Consolidating 4 separate data collection processes into one application; 2) Replacing legacy systems with an Internet web-based application; 3) Integrating ATB data with FMS central accounting data	
14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)?	
yes	
14.a. If yes, does this investment address a weakness found during the PART review?	
no	
14.b. If yes, what is the name of the PARTed program?	
Financial Management Service Government-wide Accounting	
14.c. If yes, what rating did the PART receive?	
Moderately Effective	
15. Is this investment for information technology?	
yes	
16. What is the level of the IT Project (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)?	
Level 3	
17. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council's PM Guidance)	
Project manager is in the process of being qualified for this investment	
18. Is this investment identified as high risk on the Q4 - FY 2007 agency high risk report (per OMB memorandum M-05-23)?	
yes	
19. Is this a financial management system?	
yes	
19.a. If yes, does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?	
yes	
19.a.1. If yes, which compliance area:	
Financial Systems Regulation and Accounting	
19.b. If yes, please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A11 section 52.	
GFRS (FIRST) - Governmentwide Financial Report System	
20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2008 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)	
Hardware	0
Software	4
Services	96

Other	0																												
21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?																													
yes																													
22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions.																													
Name																													
Peter Genova																													
Phone Number																													
202-874-8500																													
Title																													
FMS Senior Official for Privacy																													
Email																													
peter.genova@fms.treas.gov																													
23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?																													
yes																													
24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?																													
no																													
<b>SUMMARY OF SPEND</b>																													
1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated Government FTE Cost, and should be excluded from the amounts shown for Planning, Full Acquisition, and Operation/Maintenance. The total estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for Planning, Full Acquisition, and Operation/Maintenance. For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.																													
All amounts represent Budget Authority																													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>PY-1 &amp; Earlier</th> <th>PY</th> <th>CY</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>-2006</th> <th>2007</th> <th>2008</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning Budgetary Resources</td> <td>0.000</td> <td>0.065</td> <td>1.123</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Acquisition Budgetary Resources</td> <td>0.666</td> <td>0.542</td> <td>0.742</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maintenance Budgetary Resources</td> <td>0.420</td> <td>0.133</td> <td>0.528</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Government FTE Cost</td> <td>2.298</td> <td>3.367</td> <td>3.399</td> </tr> <tr> <td># of FTEs</td> <td>20</td> <td>36</td> <td>35</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			PY-1 & Earlier	PY	CY		-2006	2007	2008	Planning Budgetary Resources	0.000	0.065	1.123	Acquisition Budgetary Resources	0.666	0.542	0.742	Maintenance Budgetary Resources	0.420	0.133	0.528	Government FTE Cost	2.298	3.367	3.399	# of FTEs	20	36	35
	PY-1 & Earlier	PY	CY																										
	-2006	2007	2008																										
Planning Budgetary Resources	0.000	0.065	1.123																										
Acquisition Budgetary Resources	0.666	0.542	0.742																										
Maintenance Budgetary Resources	0.420	0.133	0.528																										
Government FTE Cost	2.298	3.367	3.399																										
# of FTEs	20	36	35																										
Note: For the cross-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies).																													
Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.																													
2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?																													
no																													
3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2008 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes.																													
<p>A Baseline Change Request (BCR) was approved to (1) reflect a budget cut, (2) rectify an erroneous duplication of costs being reported via two IT investments, and (3) reflect multiple changes in scope. This BCR resulted in a lifecycle cost reduction of \$56.788 million, with details as follows. 1. Budget Cut of \$1.8M (Lifecycle total -\$0.213M): In its BY08 Passback, OMB reduced funding for this investment by \$1.8M. The reduction will cause a delay in procurement of hardware, delay in commencement of development work, and delay of one year in implementation of the FIRST</p>																													

Accounting Trial Balance (ATB) application. Lifecycle costs for contractors are reduced by \$0.213M because some of the cut funding is required in subsequent years. 2. Removal of Duplicate Costs Captured in Another Investment (-\$23.525M): FMS is transitioning towards a shared technological architecture, thus reducing the need for separate hardware and software for its IT systems. The shared infrastructure costs of FIRST's Governmentwide Financial Report System (GFRS) and U.S. Standard General Ledger Interactive Database (SID) applications are operating on existing shared infrastructure platforms. These costs are presently (and erroneously) captured in two separate investments - FIRST and the Enterprise IT Infrastructure Optimization Initiative (EITIO). This BCR seeks to remove \$23.525M worth of shared infrastructure lifecycle costs erroneously reported in the FIRST E-300. 3. Multiple Changes in Scope (-\$33.050M in FTE costs): (a) FMS management has decided to halt all DME work on FIRST's GFRS application beginning in FY08 so as to redirect resources to the new FIRST Accounting Trial Balance (ATB) application planning and development efforts. Ongoing annual training of new GFRS users - which the GFRS project team had provided in the past - is being transferred to FMS Agency Services beginning in FY08 who will offer it on a reimbursable basis. The Proposed New Baseline reflects this reduction in scope along with the corresponding reduction in lifecycle costs totaling \$16.517M. (b) This BCR reflects a re-ordering of the FIRST SID development releases, resulting in significant lifecycle cost savings totaling \$9.956M. (c) This BCR incorporates the schedule extension of development work on FIRST's ATB application due to the FY08 Passback budget cut. Scope has been reduced by eliminating the capability for online data entry of ATB data, and FTE costs are reduced by \$6.577M.

## PERFORMANCE

*In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative measure.*

*Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding Measurement Area and Measurement Grouping identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at [www.egov.gov](http://www.egov.gov). The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond FY 2009.*

	Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Planned Improvement to the Baseline	Actual Results
1	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	Absolute value \$ amount of general fund balances not accounted for in Financial Report (FR) reporting.	\$15,407,067,499,492	Q4 - \$13,178,660,981,100	13,178,660,981,100
2	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Functionality	Number of Verifying federal agencies who complete their GFRS FR Closing Package submission by FMS' deadline.	FY 2006 - 34	Q1 - 35	35
3	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Reliability	Number of GFRS system fixes that need to be applied during the production window of August 15 - December 15 (measured in Q1).	35	Q1 - 28	16
4	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's	Customer Results	New Customers and Market	Number of USSGL website E-mail	1867 subscribers. Subscriptions expected to level off	2383 subscribers by Sept 2007 (Average of 43 new	Q1 - 2059, Q2 - 2181, Q3 - 2297

		Finances Effectively		Penetration	subscriptions (as an indicator of agency use of USSGL information). Baseline and target have been revised, due to error in the program that counted the subscriptions.	at approximately 3400 by FY 2010	subscribers per month, to start falling off somewhat in subsequent years): Q1-3010, Q2-3076, Q3-3142, Q4-3208	Q4 – 2509
5	2007	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	On-time publication of the Financial Report of the U.S. Government, measured as days variance from OMB's deadline (currently December 15, accelerated by 2-1/2 months in 2004)	0 days	0 days	0 days
6	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	Absolute value \$ difference between agencies' reported amounts for Transfers In/Out without Reimbursement, Approp Transf In/Out, and Unexpended Approp Transf In/Out - measured Q1 during annual FR cycle (an FR consolidation issue).	\$19,031,307,285	Q1 - 14,273,480,464 (25% reduction)	
7	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	Absolute value \$ amount of general fund balances not accounted for in Financial Report reporting.	\$13,178,660,981,100	Q2 - \$8,891,259,008,705	
8	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of USSGL website E-mail subscriptions (as an indicator of agency use of USSGL information).	2383	2741 subscribers by Sept 2008 (15% new subscribers): Q1-2435, Q2-2521, Q3-2642, Q4-2741	
9	2008	Manage the U.S.	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Average number of hours per	158 hours/quarter	Q3, Q4 - 119 hours/quarter (25%	

		Government's Finances Effectively			quarter required to update the USSGL TFM (measurement starts in June, 2008).		reduction)	
10	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	On-time publication of the Financial Report of the U.S. Government, measured as days variance from OMB's deadline (currently December 15, accelerated by 2-1/2 months in 2004)	0 days	0 days	
11	2008	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Reliability	Number of GFRS system fixes that need to be applied during the production window of August 15 - December 15 (measured in Q1).	16	14	
12	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	Absolute \$ difference between agencies' reported amounts for Transfers In/Out without Reimbursement, Appropriation Transfers In/Out, and Unexpended Appropriations Transferred In/Out (measured Q1 during the annual FR reporting cycle).	\$14,273,480,464	\$9,515,653,643 (50% reduction from FY06 baseline)	
13	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	Absolute value \$ amount of general fund balances not accounted for in Financial Report reporting.	\$8,891,259,008,705	Q2 - \$0	
14	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	% of Treasury Account Symbol (TAS) funds aligned to reporting	90%	Q3 - 95%	

					agencies for submission of ATB financial data (as measure of completeness of Financial Report "entity").			
15	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Frequency and Depth	Average monthly use of USSGL Approved Accounting Scenarios (measured annually in July).	590 visits per month	Q4 - 708 visits per month	
16	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of USSGL website E-mail subscriptions (as an indicator of agency use of USSGL information).	2741	3137 subscribers by Sept 2009 (15% new subscribers) : Q1-2800, Q2-2899, Q3-3038, Q4-3137	
17	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Annual effort by agencies' staff and consultants to research USSGL related issues.	105 FTE (estimated - to be quantified by end of FY 2007)	70	
18	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Timeliness	On-time publication of the Financial Report of the U.S. Government, measured as days variance from OMB's deadline (currently December 15, accelerated by 2-1/2 months in 2004)	0 days	0 days	
19	2009	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Reliability	Number of GFRS system fixes that need to be applied during the production window of August 15 - December 15 (measured in Q1).	14	13	
20	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	Absolute value \$ difference between agencies' reported amounts for Transfers In/Out without	\$9,515,653,643	Q1 - \$4,757,826,821 (75% reduction from FY 06 baseline)	

					Reimbursement, Approp Transf In/Out, and Unexpended Approp Transf In/Out(measured Q1 during annual FR cycle)..			
21	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	% of Treasury Account Symbol (TAS) funds aligned to reporting agencies for submission of ATB financial data (as measure of completeness of Financial Report "entity").	95%	Q3 - 98%	
22	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	New Customers and Market Penetration	Number of USSGL website E-mail subscriptions (as an indicator of agency use of USSGL information).	3137	3426 subscribers ty Sept 2010 (10% new subscribers): Q1-3183, Q2-3259, Q3-3342, Q4-3426	
23	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Productivity	Maintain the reduction in annual effort by agencies' staff and consultants to research USSGL related issues compared to pre-SID USSGL website use.	70 FTE	70 FTE	
24	2010	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	Reliability	Number of GFRS system fixes that need to be applied during the production window of August 15 - December 15 (measured in Q1).	13	12	
25	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Mission and Business Results	Central Fiscal Operations	% of Treasury Account Symbol (TAS) funds aligned to reporting agencies for submission of ATB financial data (as measure of completeness of Financial Report	98%	100%	



					"entity").			
26	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Customer Results	Availability	Accelerate the availability and timeliness of accounting validations of internal ATB data. To be measured during the 4th quarter (3rd quarter's reporting cycle).	No validations are currently provided that cross both budgetary and proprietary ATB data.	Validations of ATB data are available to be performed by the 5th workday of the first month of each quarter.	
27	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Technology	External Data Sharing	Accelerate the availability and timeliness of validations comparing agency ATB data v. data from FMS' central accounting system (specific validations to be defined by FY 2008). To be measured during the 4th quarter (3rd quarter's reporting cycle)	No validations are currently provided that compare agency proprietary ATB data to FMS' central accounting system data.	Validations of ATB data are available to be reviewed by the 5th workday of the first month of each quarter.	
28	2011	Manage the U.S. Government's Finances Effectively	Processes and Activities	Errors	Number of accounting edits/validations of ATB data input by federal agencies into FIRST (ATB) (measure of the ATB system's providing feedback to agencies about their ATB data). Baseline is based upon current FACTS II edits.	Q4 - 12	Q4 - 36	

EA
<i>In order to successfully address this area of the business case and capital asset plan you must ensure the investment is included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process, and is mapped to and supports the FEA. You must also ensure the business case demonstrates the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.</i>
1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?
yes
1.a. If no, please explain why?
N/A
2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?
yes
2.a. If yes, provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.

Financial Information and Reporting Standardization (FIRST)								
2.b. If no, please explain why?								
N/A								
3. Is this investment identified in a completed (contains a target architecture) and approved segment architecture?								
yes								
3.a. If yes, provide the name of the segment architecture as provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.								
Central Fiscal Operations Segment Architecture Roadmap (FMS)								
4. Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to <a href="http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/">http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/egov/</a> .								
Component: Use existing SRM Components or identify as NEW. A NEW component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.								
Reused Name and UPI: A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.								
Internal or External Reuse?: Internal reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. External reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.								
Funding Percentage: Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the funding level transferred to another agency to pay for the service.								
	<b>Agency Component Name</b>	<b>Agency Component Description</b>	<b>Service Type</b>	<b>Component</b>	<b>Reused Component Name</b>	<b>Reused UPI</b>	<b>Internal or External Reuse?</b>	<b>Funding %</b>
1	Internal Controls	Compilation and Consolidation of Federal Program Agency financial information for the Financial Report of the U.S. Government (GFRS + ATB applications)	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Capture			No Reuse	30
2	Knowledge Capture	Collection, validation, and analysis of Federal Program Agency accounting trial balance data (ATB application)	Financial Management	Internal Controls	Knowledge Capture	015-05-01-01-01-1102-00	Internal	50
3	Knowledge Distribution	Collection of federal program agency audited financial statement information (GFRS application) and FPA accounting trial balance data (ATB application)	Knowledge Management	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery			No Reuse	20
5. To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.								
FEA SRM Component: Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications.								

*Service Specification: In the Service Specification field, Agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.*

	SRM Component	Service Area	Service Category	Service Standard	Service Specification (i.e., vendor and product name)
1	Internal Controls	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
2	Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
3	Internal Controls	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
4	Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
5	Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Authentication / Single Sign-on	
6	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Supporting Network Services	
7	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Static Display	
8	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Dynamic Server-Side Display	
9	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Presentation / Interface	Content Rendering	
10	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Independent	TBD
11	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Business Logic	Platform Dependent	TBD
12	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Data Management	Database Connectivity	
13	Knowledge Capture	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
14	Internal Controls	Component Framework	Data Interchange	Data Exchange	
15	Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Middleware	
16	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Interface and Integration	Integration	Enterprise Application Integration	
17	Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	
18	Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Types / Validation	
19	Knowledge Capture	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Transformation	
20	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Dependent	
21	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Web Servers	

22	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
23	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Integrated Development Environment	
24	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Software Configuration Management	
25	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	
26	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
27	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
28	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
29	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Embedded Technology Devices	
30	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Network Devices / Standards	
31	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Support Platforms	Platform Independent	
32	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
33	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Storage	
34	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Media Servers	
35	Internal Controls	Component Framework	Data Management	Reporting and Analysis	
36	Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
37	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
38	Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
39	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
40	Internal Controls	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
41	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Database / Storage	Database	
42	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	
43	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Hardware / Infrastructure	Servers / Computers	

44	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
45	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Delivery Servers	Application Servers	
46	Internal Controls	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
47	Knowledge Capture	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
48	Knowledge Distribution and Delivery	Service Access and Delivery	Service Transport	Service Transport	
49	Knowledge Capture	Service Platform and Infrastructure	Software Engineering	Test Management	

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., FirstGov, Pay.Gov, etc)?

yes

6.a. If yes, please describe.

As part of the 2006 alternatives analysis that was conducted, FMS evaluated the FARS/Treasury Information Executive Repository (TIER) system in use by the Treasury Department. It was selected as the best alternative. TIER will require some modification for use in a governmentwide environment, but it provides an excellent foundation for FIRST's accounting trial balance data collection functionality and will save considerable development effort.

## PART TWO

### RISK

*You should perform a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of the investment's life-cycle, develop a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.*

Answer the following questions to describe how you are managing investment risks.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?

yes

1.a. If yes, what is the date of the plan?

2007-07-01

1.b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?

yes

1.c. If yes, describe any significant changes:

The FIRST risk management plan is reviewed and updated monthly. Overall Project Failure continues to be medium impact and probability, but the nature of the risk has changed. With the change in Treasury's Fiscal Assistant Secretary, and the approval by that office of the FIRST Concept of Operations, there is higher confidence in the support of the project champion. However, with the OMB FY 2008 Budget Passback cut of 40% of the requested FY 2008 funds and the threat of future budget cuts, continuation of the selected alternative - which requires contractor support for development - is placed at higher risk.

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

Life cycle costs and schedule for FIRST were risk-adjusted for the three systems included in the FIRST investment (GFRS, SID, and ATB). In the case of GFRS, which is in production, enhancement work for FY2007 will be limited to the contractor resources currently working on the contract. The risk of additional new requirements for FY2007 is controlled because new requirements will be limited to that which can be accomplished by current resources without jeopardizing the application's production cycle. As a risk adjustment, future steady state support for GFRS is estimated at the same contractor development support level (two developers) as for current enhancement support. In the case of the SID project, one month was added to the FY 2008 development milestone schedule to reflect the recent change to FMS' RAD methodology and the project team's unfamiliarity with the methodology. Future RAD releases for future yet-to-be-defined requirements were incorporated into both schedule and cost. In the case of the ATB project, the development contractor

for Treasury's production TIER application - which will be the core for the ATB system - estimated the costs based upon initial business requirements. A 30% risk factor was applied to the estimated costs to reflect the fact that the contract has not been issued, and application detailed requirements have not yet been defined. In the case of other ATB project contractor services, contractor costs were developed using contracts from other projects for similar types of services and an inflation factor was applied.

## COST & SCHEDULE

*1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard 748?*

yes

*2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than  $\pm 10\%$ ?*

yes

*2.a. If yes, was it the?*

Both

*2.b. If yes, explain the variance.*

Favorable cost variances were due to having erroneously included planned costs for shared IT infrastructure services that were not included in actual costs reported due to their being reported under the FMS Consolidated Infrastructure reporting. A baseline change request was submitted to correct the plan. Cost variances were also favorable due to the plan's including very conservative estimates of FTE effort for SID. The BCR addresses more realistic estimates based upon actual project experience. Favorable schedule variances were primarily related to the a schedule revision that resulted in SID requirements definition concluding earlier than originally planned.

*2.c. If yes, what corrective actions are being taken?*

Cost estimating processes have been revised to exclude the costs of shared IT infrastructure that are already reflected in another E300, and to better consider project experience in estimating FTE efforts. The SID system project revisited its FTE estimates based upon experience with the project and its specific team. The business members of the SID project team are inexperienced in project development and project estimating and were very conservative in their work estimates. Industry literature documents that there can be a very large discrepancy in the effort expended by developers of different skill and experience levels. The cost and schedule impact of scope changes and the FY 2008 Budget Passback cut of \$1.8 million have been estimated. The new Project Manager revised the ATB project schedule to reflect the impact of budget cuts in the FY 2008 passback, and the GFRS project schedule was revised to reflect decreased scope for FY 2007 and future enhancements. These changes have been incorporated in a Programmatic Baseline Change Request that was approved by the Treasury Investment Review Board on June 21, 2007.

*3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?*

yes

*3.a. If yes, when was it approved by the agency head?*

2007-12-13